



**Laurelhurst Community Center
Expansion Project
Advisory Council / PAT Meeting
September 15, 2005
Meeting Minutes**

Pat and Advisory Council present: Alan Hovland; Nate Benjamin; Kathleen Hebert; Christine Barrett; Susan Moe; Joe Herrin.

Staff present: Tom Ostrom, Parks; Lori Chisholm, Parks; Dan Johnson, Parks project manager; Karen Lynch, Parks; Dave Yim, Parks community center staff; Catherine Hart, VIA Suzuki.

7 p.m. Meeting Open - Dan Johnson

Dan opened the meeting and briefly talked about construction cost concerns. In the past week, the price of plywood rose by \$3.00/sheet and the week of September 15, it had increased even more – by \$5.00/sheet, mainly due to recent hurricane-related events. This is just an example of concerns about construction costs and in particular, petroleum-based products.

This project goes out to bid around the end of the year, and we'll hope for the best.

The Landmarks Board will see these design revisions again, the morning of Sept. 16.

7:15 Design Review- Catherine Hart

Catherine reviewed changes in this iteration of design, which she called “better quality overall”:

- Reduced size of the multi-purpose room; it will now approximately 1200 sq. ft.
- Multi-purpose room is no longer dividable
- Deleted one family restroom, and instead, made it a kiln room
- In the new design, there is 1 finished activity room vs. 2 activity rooms (only 1 finished)
- We will reuse the existing boiler system (to reduce costs)
- Stairwell is not much different but will now have a large window at landing, to see out
- Reduced square footage helps bring the scale of addition down to the scale of old building
- However, this final design plan retains the “same “spirit”
- All rooms will be finished
- Will now have programmable space right outside lower activity room

Exterior

- Stained wood- upper level
- Synthetic Slate roofing: possibility as an add alternate
- Brick on both sides of the wall (on stairwell)
- Bay windows: clear anodized aluminum
- Ground face concrete block will also be used
- Possibly the interior elevator shaft will be brick (or might be concrete block)
- Multi-purpose room, though smaller, will be similar in design
- Multi-purpose room will have a French balcony (decorative – can't step out onto it)
- It will also have wood beams in its ceiling, as before
- There will still be skylights between the two buildings (serving as a connector)
- Catherine also re-looked at the downstairs: connecting spaces (lower level) – new design puts a partition there to “connect” and also allow for big gatherings

Comments on the revised design:

- From a staff and programming standpoint, Dave Yim feels this design does slightly limit flexibility of programming but, for example, dance classes can still be held in the multi-purpose room - in a smaller space
- Al Hovland feels gatherings will occur mostly in fireplace & multi-purpose rooms.
- Al also suggested putting display cases, etc. on the main level, on casters. They could be easily moved to turn the fireplace room or lobby into a larger area that connects to the new multi-purpose room for gatherings and rentals. The group liked this idea.
- PAT members did feel that being able to separate the fireplace room would be helpful. Dan suggests that “in construction” they may want to examine the space and re-evaluate. VIA Suzuki could also include a fixed separation as an add alternate during the bid process.
- Regarding the fireplace room, Dan Johnson voiced a concern about standards and Landmark requirements and wants to double check any restrictions. He also wants to get this to bid soon, due to rising construction costs. He said that during construction, we might be able to make the fireplace room dividable as a possible change order.
- The community also plans to try and raise added funds.

Budget: a general discussion ensued about costs. **Comments and questions:**

- Comment: Reducing overall space in the new addition by one-third will not reduce the overall costs by one-third.

- Question: Why spend more on slate roofing?
- Comment: Community would rather see less wood and more brick. (possibly brick between the metal stripping instead of wood).
- Question about *other* possible “additives” when bidding. Dan does not recommend more than 3 and listed them, in order of the group’s preference:
 - 1). Fireplace Room wall / some type of partition
 - 2.) Brick on the exterior (more brick / less wood)
 - 3.) Lower floor partition or door
- Question about the exterior lower wall surface? It will be concrete and CMU clear coated, no color. Coating to protect from graffiti.
- Question: When the construction fence goes up, will the playground be open? Answer: Yes. We will provide portable toilets and will also open the tennis courts. You will not be able to drive up to it but you will be able to walk to it.
- Catherine was asked if she recommends any other additives -- she said that the original design called for a “green” roof but that it’s not going to be worth the money to attempt it. (Dan noted that trees can harm asphalt roofing.)
- Dan agreed that a fireplace room wall could be used to define space on the main level (Lori Chislom & Dave Yim both agreed. They need “defined space” for programs).
- It’s uncertain whether we can afford more brick (exterior). Design already puts brick on the wall between the buildings. Dan feels adding more brick might put us on the ‘budget edge’. Added brick also brings up the Landmark Commissions’ caveat on avoiding “false historicism” and possible permit concerns.
- Everyone seemed to agree that putting brick on the elevator wall is *not* the way to go. since brick is expensive. Joe Herrin stated that he’s fine with a wood exterior.

Next Steps:

The facility will close on December 1st. Dan committed to calling an additional meeting if anything out of the ordinary comes up or there are changes to discuss.

Building permits are currently taking twelve weeks. Dan said that, at a guess, the “Notice to Proceed” for this project will be sometime around the end of February.

Adjourn: 8:00 p.m.